

Remarks

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §112:

Claims 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, being indefinite for recitation of the term polymer. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejection. Specifically, Applicants have amended to claims to recite the term polyamine.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102:

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-16, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e or a) as being anticipated by Pinchuk et al. (US 2002/0107330) ('330). In the office action dated August 31, 2006, claim 9 was not included in the rejection based on '330. In response to the action, Applicants incorporated all the limitations of claim 9 into claim 1. Claim 19 was also amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 9. While '330 teaches the use of polyvinyl ethers, '330 does not teach **reversible** modification of amines on a polyvinyl ether polymer by attachment of functional groups via pH labile covalent bonds. The Examiner has not provided any evidence or reasoning to suggest that '330 teaches reversible modification of amines on a polyvinyl ether polymer.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wolff et al. (US 20010036926) ('926). Applicants respectfully disagree. '926 does not teach the **reversible** modification of any amines or the reversible modification of a membrane active polyamine.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wolff et al. (US 7,087,770) ('770). Applicants respectfully disagree. '770 does not teach the **reversible** modification of any amines or the reversible modification of a membrane active polyamine.

Double Patenting:

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under the judicially reacted doctrine on obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent 7,087,770. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 1-7 of '770 do not recite **reversible** modification of any amines. Nor do the claims of '770 encompass **reversible** modification of any amines. '770 teaches and claims only labile **disulfide** bonds. Amines can not be

Appl. No. **10/780,484**  
Amdt. Dated **06/05/2007**  
Reply to Office action of: **03/6/2007**

**reversibly** modified by formation of disulfide bonds. Only thiols can be reversibly modified by formation of disulfide bonds.

The Examiner's objections and rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-7, and 10-20 should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk Ekena/  
Kirk Ekena, Reg. No. 56,672  
Mirus Bio Corporation  
505 South Rosa Road  
Madison, WI 53719  
608-238-4400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the USPTO on this date: 5 June 2007.

/Kirk Ekena/  
Kirk Ekena